

REMARKS

The Examiner objects to claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 as improperly multiply dependent.

However, these claims were cancelled in an Article 34 Amendment filed in the PCT phase of this Section 371 application. This Article 34 Amendment, translated into English, was filed with the original application papers entering the U.S. national phase on February 26, 2006. Another "clean" copy of the claims as amended was also filed on October 23, 2006 as part of the Annexes to the IPE Report purported not to be part of the Report as initially filed.

Applicants therefore believe that these objections are moot ab initio. They also note that the Examiner's substantive comments regarding the claims not cancelled reflect that he may have been examining claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13-14 before the Article 34 Amendments.

Apparatus claims 1,-3, 6, and 7, and method claims 8-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by US 2001/0033327 to Uomori et al. ("Uomori"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

First, they appear to be directed to the claims before the Article 34 Amendments. Second, these claims are now cancelled in favor of new claims 15-36, which define patentable subject matter over Uomori as discussed below in greater detail.

New independent claim 15 includes subject matter of claim 1 as well as subject matter relating to the first embodiment of this invention as described in paragraphs [0030] to [0057], and especially [0043] and [0047]. The claim recites a "first display portion having a first display size and a first display resolution." An image processing portion changes the three-dimensional image data based on control information that contains a "standard display size and a standard resolution of a standard display portion" different from the first display portion. Claim 15 is expressly that a decision on whether to change a first amount of parallax on the first display is

based on a comparison of a first pitch between dots of the first display and a standard pitch between dots of the standard display.

New independent claim 16 is like claim 15. "A standard display size and standard resolution" appearing in claim 15 is changed to "a standard pitch between dots" in claim 16. This subject matter is supported in paragraph [0055].

New independent claim 17 differs from claim 15 in that "a standard display size and a standard resolution" in claim 15 is changed to "number of dots per unit area" in claim 17. This subject matter is also supported by paragraph [0055].

New independent claim 18 differs from claim 15 in that "a standard display size and a standard resolution of a standard display portion" in claim 15 is changed to "a standard image size of the three-dimensional image data displayed on a standard display portion" in claim 18. The change is also supported by paragraph [0055].

New dependent claims 19-22 are supported by paragraphs [0045]-[0046] and steps "ST104" to "ST106" in Fig. 4.

New independent claim 23 is supported by original independent claim 6 and the second embodiment described in paragraphs [0058]-[0065], and especially paragraphs [0058] and [0061].

New dependent claims 24-25 are supported by paragraph [0058].

New method claims 26-36 correspond to the new apparatus claims 15-26, respectively.

Uomori describes a stereoscopic image reproducing apparatus that reproduces a three-dimensional (3D) image based on factors that include camera parameters, the size of the display of the image, and distance information, including the distance dx from the camera. The Examiner cites decision means 11, the Uomori Abstract, and Uomori paragraphs [0041], [0042], [0049], [0058], and [0061].

Control parameters are cited in paragraphs [0041] and [0042]. Image processing means 6 is cited as adjusting the camera separation W_c (Fig. 4) to bring the image into a range where it can be viewed by a user (citing paragraph [0061]). This same paragraph is cited as teaching a 'horizontal shift of the image' to reject claim 1 (emphasis supplied). Paragraph [0056] is cited as teaching the claim 3 "resizing means." The Examiner argues that a change in the camera distance dx leads to a change in the image size.

In response, with respect to independent claims 15-18 and 26-29, Applicants first note that in Uomori, a criterion for controlling a display of stereoscopic CG image is viewer's binocular fusional range (see [0058] and abstract). In other words, the main purpose of Uomori is to adjust camera and display parameters to achieve "fusional ranges" where left and right eyes of a user can blend left and right viewed images into a stereoscopic 3D image.

In sharp contrast, in the present invention, a criterion for controlling a display of three-dimensional image data is a standard pitch between dots of the standard display determined by using standard information containing any one of the following features (a) – (d).

(a) display size and a resolution (claims 15 and 26)

(b) pitch between dots (claims 16 and 27)

(c) number of dots per unit area (claims 17 and 28)

(d) standard image size of the three-dimensional image data displayed on a standard display portion (claims 18 and 29)

Therefore, there are different criteria than taught or suggested by Uomori. That is, Uomori fails to disclose the standard pitch between dots and the standard information containing any one of the above-mentioned features (a) – (d). Uomori fails

to disclose the claimed decision portion/step using the standard pitch between dots and the standard information, and these claims define patentably over Uomori.

Applicants do not find in Uomori an understanding of the problem of display that is set to a standard display having a certain resolution and size, where the actual display is at a different size and resolution – the problem depicted in Fig. 8 of the present application.

Nor does Uomori teach or suggest a decision means for deciding if a first amount of parallax on the first display portion after three-dimensional image data has been displayed needs to be changed or not, based on control information as stated in the independent claims, e.g., a standard display size and a standard resolution of a standard display portion as compared to these parameters of the first display portion. Uomori appears not to mention a "standard display," or the problem of resolution and size when a display is not a pre-set display with a known resolution and size.

With respect to independent claims 23 and 34, Uomori fails to disclose or suggest the standard information containing a standard amount of parallax of a three-dimensional image.

Therefore, Uomori fails to disclose or suggest the claimed process using the standard amount of parallax, and these claims also define patentably over Uomori.

In view of the above amendments, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Peter J. Mahus

Registration No.: 26,766
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

Customer No. 21874

P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 517-5530
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant